

Application No.: 10/729,534
Office Action Dated: March 24, 2006
Response to Office Action Dated: May 1, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1, 18 and 19 are amended herein.

The Examiner objects to the specification based on matters of terminology. The specification is being amended herein to address the objected to terms. For example, the specification is amended to more clearly distinguish between the distal ends of the sidewalls and the distal ends of the standoffs. Likewise, the amendments more clearly distinguish between the proximal ends of the sidewalls and the proximal ends of the standoffs. The specification is also amended to ensure that the reference numbers correspond to those shown in the drawings. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the objection to the specification is now overcome.

Claims 1, 18 and 19 and claims dependent thereon are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested, particularly in view of the clarifying amendments to the specification and claims.

The claims have been amended to remove the objected to term "edge". With respect to the term "recess", Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement that this term is not supported in the specification. Paragraph [0029] of the specification states that "...the support surface 14 and the sidewalls 16, 16 cooperate to define a recess or open-ended structure on the underside of the platform 10." With respect to the term "floor" as recited in claim 4, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement that this term is not supported in the specification. Paragraph [0030] states that "...the standoffs 22, 22 may include a floor or be substantially or partially open-ended at the distal end." It is therefore respectfully submitted that the § 112, first paragraph rejection is now overcome.

Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested, particularly in view of the clarifying

Application No.: 10/729,534
Office Action Dated: March 24, 2006
Response to Office Action Dated: May 1, 2006

amendments to the specification and the claims.

With respect to claim 1, the specification is amended to clarify by reference numbers and more clearly distinguish between the proximal and distal ends of the sidewalls, and the proximal and distal ends of the standoffs.

With respect to claim 3, the specification is amended to more clearly match the terminology "generally hollow interior" as part of the original disclosure recited in claim 3.

With respect to claim 4, the specification is amended to more clearly match the terminology "distal end of the standoff" as part of the original disclosure recited in claim 4.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the § 112, second paragraph rejection is now overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

No fees or deficiencies in fees are believed to be owed. However, authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 13-0235 in the event any such fees are owed.

Respectfully submitted,

By *Daniel G. Mackas*
Daniel G. Mackas
Registration No. 38,541
Attorney for Applicant

McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
(860) 549-5290